



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
P.O. BOX 1450
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450
WWW.USPTO.GOV

BS
Certificate
Oct 11 2006
of Correction

Paper No. Ten

J. Harold Nissen
McAulay Nissen Goldberg Kiel & Hand, LLP
261 Madison Avenue
New York NY 10016-2391

COPY MAILED

SEP 27 2006

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

In re Application of	:
Sung Moon Chun et al.	:
Application No. 09/195,897	:
Filed: November 19, 1998	:
Attorney Docket No.	:
06730/017001	:
Title: OBJECT-BASED CODING AND	:
DECODING APPARATUSES AND	:
METHODS FOR IMAGE SIGNALS	:

This is a decision on the petition filed December 27, 2005, pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.181(a), to revive the above-identified application. Supplements to this petition were received on March 1, 2006 and June 8, 2006.

The Office regrets the period of delay in issuing this decision.

BACKGROUND

The above-identified application became abandoned for failure to submit the issue fee and corrected drawings in a timely manner in reply to the Notice of Allowance and Issue Fee Due, mailed March 7, 2005, which set a shortened statutory period for reply of three months. No extensions of time are permitted for transmitting issue fees¹. Accordingly, the above-identified application became abandoned on June 8, 2005. A Notice of Abandonment was mailed on October 27, 2005.

¹ See MPEP §710.02(e).

With the present petition, Petitioner has asserted that the Notice of Allowance and Issue Fee Due was not received.

RELEVANT PORTIONS OF THE MPEP AND C.F.R.

MPEP §711.03(c)(I)(A) sets forth, in toto:

In *Delgar v. Schulyer*, 172 USPQ 513 (D.D.C. 1971), the court decided that the Office should mail a new Notice of Allowance in view of the evidence presented in support of the contention that the applicant's representative did not receive the original Notice of Allowance. Under the reasoning of *Delgar*, an allegation that an Office action was never received may be considered in a petition to withdraw the holding of abandonment. If adequately supported, the Office may grant the petition to withdraw the holding of abandonment and remail the Office action. That is, the reasoning of *Delgar* is applicable regardless of whether an application is held abandoned for failure to timely pay the issue fee (35 U.S.C. 151) or for failure to prosecute (35 U.S.C. 133).

To minimize costs and burdens to practitioners and the Office, the Office has modified the showing required to establish nonreceipt of an Office action. The showing required to establish nonreceipt of an Office communication must include a statement from the practitioner stating that the Office communication was not received by the practitioner and attesting to the fact that a search of the file jacket and docket records indicates that the Office communication was not received. A copy of the docket record where the nonreceived Office communication would have been entered had it been received and docketed must be attached to and referenced in practitioner's statement. For example, if a three month period for reply was set in the nonreceived Office action, a copy of the docket report showing all replies docketed for a date three months from the mail date of the nonreceived Office action must be submitted as documentary proof of nonreceipt of the Office action.

The showing outlined above may not be sufficient if there are circumstances that point to a conclusion that the Office action may have been lost after receipt rather than a conclusion that the Office action was lost in the mail (e.g., if the practitioner has a history of not receiving Office actions). Evidence of nonreceipt of an Office communication or action (e.g., Notice of Abandonment or an advisory action) other than that action to which reply was required to avoid abandonment would not warrant withdrawal of the holding of abandonment. Abandonment takes place by operation of law for failure to reply to an Office action or timely pay the issue fee, not by operation of the mailing of a Notice of Abandonment. See *Lorenz v. Finkl*, 333 F.2d 885, 889-90, 142 USPQ 26, 29-30 (CCPA 1964); *Krahn v. Commissioner*, 15 USPQ2d 1823, 1824 (E.D. Va 1990); *In re Application of Fischer*, 6 USPQ2d 1573, 1574 (Comm'r Pat. 1988).

§ 1.134 Time period for reply to an Office action.

An Office action will notify the applicant of any non-statutory or shortened statutory time period set for reply to an Office action. Unless the applicant is notified in writing that a reply is required in less than six months, a maximum period of six months is allowed.

[47 FR 41276, Sept. 17, 1982, effective Oct. 1, 1982; revised, 62 FR 53131, Oct. 10, 1997, effective Dec. 1, 1997]

§ 1.135 Abandonment for failure to reply within time period.

(a) If an applicant of a patent application fails to reply within the time period provided under § 1.134 and § 1.136, the application will become abandoned unless an Office action indicates otherwise.

(b) Prosecution of an application to save it from abandonment pursuant to paragraph (a) of this section must include such complete and proper reply as the condition of the application may require. The admission of, or refusal to admit, any amendment after final rejection or any amendment not responsive to the last action, or any related proceedings, will not operate to save the application from abandonment.

(c) When reply by the applicant is a bona fide attempt to advance the application to final action, and is substantially a complete reply to the non-final Office action, but consideration of some matter or compliance with some requirement has been inadvertently omitted, applicant may be given a new time period for reply under § 1.134 to supply the omission.

[Paras. (a), (b), and (c), 47 FR 41276, Sept. 17, 1982, effective Oct. 1, 1982; para. (d) deleted, 49 FR 555, Jan. 4, 1984, effective Apr. 1, 1984; revised, 62 FR 53131, Oct. 10, 1997, effective Dec. 1, 1997]

ANALYSIS

Petitioner has asserted that he failed to receive the notice in question. Petitioner has failed to provide a copy of the docket record where the nonreceived Office communication would have been entered had it been received and docketed, and it does not appear that he has searched the file jacket and docket records for this communication.

Petitioner has included a change of address which contains a certificate of mailing dated June 30, 1999, although it is noted that it appears that Petitioner has failed to provide a statement from the individual who executed this certificate of mailing, Ms. Ruth Montalvo.

CONCLUSION

For these reasons, the petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.181 must be DISMISSED.

Any reply must be submitted within **TWO MONTHS** from the mail date of this decision. Extensions of time under 37 C.F.R. §1.136(a) are permitted. The reply should include a cover letter entitled "Renewed Petition Under 37 C.F.R. 1.181." This is not a final agency action within the meaning of 5 U.S.C 704.

The renewed petition should indicate in a prominent manner that the attorney handling this matter is Paul Shanoski, and may be submitted by mail¹, hand-delivery², or facsimile³.

Alternatively, Petitioner may wish to consider submitting a petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a) and/or (b).

Telephone inquiries regarding this decision should be directed to the undersigned at (571) 272-3225⁴. All other inquiries concerning examination procedures or status of the application should be directed to the Technology Center.

The Change of Correspondence Address and Power of Attorney has been entered and made of record.



Paul Shanoski
Senior Attorney
Office of Petitions
United States Patent and Trademark Office

1 Mail Stop Petition, Commissioner for Patents, United States Patent and Trademark Office, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA, 22313-1450.

2 Customer Window, Randolph Building, 401 Dulaney Street, Alexandria, VA, 22314.

3 (571) 273-8300- please note this is a central facsimile number.

4 Petitioner will note that all practice before the Office should be in writing, and the action of the Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. See 37 C.F.R. §1.2. As such, Petitioner is reminded that no telephone discussion may be controlling or considered authority for Petitioner's further action(s).